

Section A Agricultural Concept Proposal Results

PIN	Rank	Applicant	Title	Proposed Applicant Share	Requested Funds	Comment*	Invite Back?
10128	1	Solano Irrigation District	Vaughn Canal Lining	\$2,019,600	\$224,400	In the Step II application applicant should document the status of the groundwater table underneath the canal. Include considerably more detail in the task lists and budgets. Designate where the conserved water would go.	Yes
10302	2	Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District	Water Conservation and Management Project	\$411,400	\$2,173,464	Reduce administration costs. Evaluate local benefits in the calculation of cost share including energy savings and labor savings.	Yes
10167	3	Ducks Unlimited	Llano Seco Water Conveyance Structure Replacement Project	\$398,235	\$2,088,848	Applicant should explain relationship between who pumps the water and uses and the agreements that were developed. The relationship between all the parties mentioned in the Step I proposal was not clear. Local cost share should increase if the project will result in a \$50,000/year energy savings.	Yes
10286	4	Placer County Water Agency	Newcastle Canal & Upper Banvard Canal Seepage Reduction	\$224,200	\$432,830	Applicant should adjust cost share to reflect the value of increased water supply or explain and provide assurances that saved water will remain in the river.	Yes
10274	5	El Dorado County Water Agency	CABY Regional Water System Reliability & Ag Cons. Project	\$5,149,636	\$1,920,000	1.) Include only water use efficiency costs. 2.) Provide how water savings estimates were developed. 3.) Fully document local benefits including value of added water supply and energy savings. 4.) Describe what happens to the seepage that is currently lost from the canal reaches. 5.) Consider if the project is locally cost effective. Project is 36% Urban and 64% Ag- State and Local Shares adjusted accordingly.	Yes
10247	6	Solano Irrigation District	Weyand Canal Lateral Piping	\$674,100	\$74,900	Provide more detail on how water conservation estimates are determined.	Yes
10354	7	Tulare Irrigation District	Spill Reduction Automation Project	\$299,750	\$599,500	This proposal needs considerably more detail about the sites, types of modernization, measurements and data, calculations of spills averted. Basically, more detail on every level: Task lists, Scope of Work.	Yes
10442	8	Amador Water Agency	Amador Canal & Lone Canal Pipe Conversion Project	\$3,138,000	\$640,000	Applicant should provide assurances that the saved water will remain in the river.	Yes
10372	9	Imperial Irrigation District	Lateral Heading Automation Program	\$900,396	\$900,396	Project costs are high compared to water savings. Provide a water savings estimate specific to the canals to be automated and explain why other headings have been automated by the district and grant funds are needed for this project. Provide illustrations/ diagrams of proposed project.	Yes
10273	10	Anderson-Cottonwood Irrigation District	Main Canal Modernization Project	\$50,000	\$425,888	Applicant should identify how much of the 20,000 of the entire project is expected to save from each project component. Specify what is being funded in the project, which canal structure will be built and identify the water savings from each specific structure.	Yes

10190	11	Western Shasta Resource Conservation District	Cow Creek Water Use Efficiency	\$279,848	\$2,436,139	Justify the costs, because they seem high based on water savings. List water savings and associated costs for each mile of canal. Consider lining canal for portions where water loss is high based on seepage. Provide more detailed information on ID operations and convert 7 cfs into af in order to determine total annual water savings. Detail the length of the irrigation season when determining annual water use.	Yes
10308	12	Santa Clara Valley Water District	Water meters for existing ag irrigation systems	\$43,800	\$64,000	Applicant should resubmit the proposal in Step II as cost effective to obtain 10% funding. Target the 40 meters at larger fields, Calculate local benefits based on grower water cost and energy savings and added water supply to the district	Yes
10368	13	Imperial Irrigation District	Concrete Canal Lining	\$700,429	\$700,429	Operational and maintenance costs are not eligible for funding. Applicant should explain why this work is not covered as part of their operations and maintenance program. Develop additional information on how conserving Colorado River water will positively impact SWP operations. Provide some actual figures and provide a more concise range of water savings estimates.	Yes
10244	14	Lindsey-Strathmore Irrigation District	High Level Reservoir	\$24,320	\$219,022	Unclear if entire district qualifies as a disadvantaged community, project benefits appear to benefit the entire district. Need to see specifics, like a task list and details about the offset water. Provide more information on how water savings were calculated with the installation of the line.	Yes
10429	15	Orland Unit Water Users Association	Orland Project Regulating Reservoir Construction	\$112,600	\$2,435,750	Reduce cost contingencies to 10% of project cost. Applicant should explain the economics of the exchange of saved water and include any benefit from exchanging the water in the cost share along with operational efficiencies gained from the project. The project itself is sound, but the local cost-share seems drastically too low, even for a disadvantaged community. Applicant should improve the proposal by taking on more of the costs, especially for standard district tasks, like training operator and grower outreach, and data collection and reporting requirements. Make the link between reduced spill in the Orland Unit and decreased diversions from the Sacramento River more explicit. As there is some potential benefit in saving of spillage water, this proposal can be considered further if costs are made reasonable and the matching of funds improved.	Yes
10383	16	Richvale Irrigation District	Canal automated water control & structure refurbishment	\$160,000	\$1,600,000	Provide a better estimate of spillage reduction and water savings. Include all local benefits in cost share. This proposal was very vague. Applicant should provide more detail in the Full Proposal: specific sites and results, a detailed Task List and Scope of Work, precise descriptions of proposed monitoring and data collection. Need well qualified contractors. Demonstrate the district is ready to take on a task of this magnitude.	Yes

10431	17	Santa Clara Valley Water District	Better Not Wetter Farms-Ag Irrigation Upgrades Rebate Program	\$300,000	\$474,900	Proposal should re-evaluate rebate given to growers. Rebate should be lower and districts cost share higher. Provide more information on the level of participation to support the water savings estimate, for examples surveys.	Yes
10301	18	Friant Water Authority	Friant-Kern Canal Liner Extension	\$0	\$2,999,500	Provide cost share. Project focus is on water supply development.	Yes
10253	19	Rancho California Water District	Real-time, Web-based Ag Water Mgmt.	\$264,180	\$362,250	Include statements from growers that this would be a useful service for them. Provide details on adoption rates and how many people want the systems. Explain when the automatic meters vs. the smart controllers will be used. Provide results from the pilot project conducted on the smart controllers. Provide acreage covered. Justify local cost share.	Yes
The proposals below this line scored below 70 points.							
10243	20	Alta Irrigation District	Kennedy Wasteway/Sand Ridge Canal	\$457,000	\$1,345,870	This is a local construction project looking for funding, not particularly a WUE project. Cost is high based on water savings.	No
10461	21	Nevada Irrigation District	Combie-Ophir IV Canal	\$500,063	\$800,000	Small water savings to the State. Project is primarily geared towards providing local water supply reliability. State costs per unit of water savings are high.	No
10275	22	Lost Hills Water District	Reservoir 2 Improvement Project	\$80,628	\$228,971	The project benefits are primarily local and does offer much benefit to the State.	No
10209	23	San Benito County Water District	Tailwater & Subsurface Drainage Water Management Systems	\$355,696	\$1,066,981	Proposal states that primary irrigation systems in the district are sprinkler and drip. These systems should have 30% runoff or seepage. Provide more evidence that growers want the systems, and that the state would get the benefits, rather than local grower.	No
10394	24	Arvin-Edison Water Storage District	Wasteway Spill Water Recovery System Renovation	\$1,708,000	\$3,000,000	High project costs with relatively low water savings.	No
10409	25	Orange Cove Irrigation District	Traveling Water Screen Installation	\$222,250	\$667,000	Water savings estimates are not clear. Not sure if project is a water use efficiency project.	No
Proposals below this line were ineligible and not scored.							
10213	n/a	City of Galt	Wastewater Treatment Plant Reclamation Project			Not eligible due to project being wastewater treatment.	No

*Universal panel comments: 1. All co-applicants must meet the UWMP requirements, if applicable. 2. Matching local funds can not come from State funds